



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/564,796

02/28/2007

Anita Dekker

72998-014000

3345

33717

7590

05/29/2009

GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP (LA)  
2450 COLORADO AVENUE, SUITE 400E  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404

EXAMINER

LIU, SAMUEL W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1656

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/564,796	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DEKKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SAMUEL W. LIU	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1656

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The preliminary amendment filed 1/13/06 which amends claims 1-20 has been entered. The following Office action is applied to claims 1-20.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

Group I, claims 1-10, drawn to a method of preparing a mixture of peptides having high arginine and lysine content comprising cleaving proteins into peptides, allowing the peptides to bind to cation exchange resin and eluting bound peptides.

Group II, claims 11-15, drawn to a composition comprising mixture of arginine and lysine rich peptides, and a medicament comprising the composition thereof.

Group III, claim 16, drawn to a method of elevation of nitric oxide blood levels comprising administering to a subject in need the composition which contains arginine and lysine rich peptides.

Group IV, claim 17, drawn to a method of increasing aerobic capacity in muscle tissue comprising administering to a subject in need the composition which contains arginine and lysine rich peptides.

Group V, claims 18-19, drawn to a method of treating disorder associated with reduced and/or inadequate vasodilation or increased blood platelet aggregation (wherein vasodilation was caused by platelet aggregation, see abstract, see Borgdorff et al. (2000) J. Thorac. Cardiovasc. Surg., 120, 12-19) comprising administering to a subject in need the composition which contains arginine and lysine rich peptides.

Group VI, claim 20, drawn to a method of stimulating growth hormone levels comprising administering to a subject in need the composition which contains arginine and lysine rich peptides.

Art Unit: 1656

Group VII, claim 20, drawn to a method of stimulating immune response comprising administering to a subject in need the composition which contains arginine and lysine rich peptides.

Group VIII, claim 20, drawn to a method of improving regulation of blood glucose levels comprising administering to a subject in need the composition which contains arginine and lysine rich peptides.

The polypeptide of Group II, claims 11-15 is obvious over Weinbach et al. (US 2005/0196443 A1). Prior to the effective filing date of the instant application, at patent claims 1, 14 and 15, Weinbach et al. teach the formulation comprising polylysine and protamine which is arginine rich molecule. Therefore, the claimed composition does not constitute a special technical feature linking all claims, e.g., the methods of Groups III-VIII method comprise use of said composition, as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 and 37 CFR 1.475(a), as a single contribution over the art, and a holding of lack of unity is therefore proper.

#### ***Additional Election Under 35 USC 121***

Applicants are further required under 35 US 121 (1) to elect a single disclosed disease state molecule to which claims are restricted; and (2) to list all claims readable thereon including those subsequently added.

If Group V is elected, applicants are required to elect one disease state from claim 19 because, the diseases set forth in the claim such as arteriosclerosis and diabetes are distinct/different each other in patient population, pathological mechanism and treatment schedule and outcome, and thus, they do not overlap each other.

It should be noted that this additional election of the restriction requirement is not species election but rather the additional election under 35 US 121 since, as discussed above, treatment schedules and outcomes as well as patient populations of the diseases, e.g., arteriosclerosis and diabetes are patentably distinct from each other.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

Art Unit: 1656

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Art Unit: 1656

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel Wei Liu, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0949. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday 9:00 -5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Andrew Wang, can be reached on (571) 272-0811. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communication and (703) 305-3014 for the after final communication.

Application/Control Number: 10/564,796

Page 6

Art Unit: 1656

/Samuel W Liu/

Examiner, Art Unit 1656

May 19, 2009

/Andrew Wang/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1656